

SEP 24 2007

Docket No. F-8660

Ser. No. 10/553,173

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 are now pending in this application and are rejected.

Claims 1-10 are previously cancelled. Claims 11, 16 and 18 are amended herein to clarify the invention and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues. In particular, further language was added to the clause introducing the pressing member in claims 11 and 18 to elaborate on the structural relationship of the pressing member to the rotary member. The amended language elaborates upon but is not appending additional structural limitations as the structural relationship between the pressing and rotary members is already recited in clauses introducing other elements. Other formal matters are attended to that were not addressed by the Examiner and accordingly are considered unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Fatheree (U.S. Pat. No. 5,013,015) in view of Vanistendael (U.S. Pat. No. 4,620,695). More specifically, the Office Action asserts that the Fatheree discloses all the elements except for the holding means which is disclosed in Vanistendael.

Docket No. F-8660

Ser. No. 10/553,173

MPEP §2143 states that “[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for failing to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and, alternatively, avers that the claims as amended overcome the case of obviousness.

Neither Fatheree nor Vanistendael disclose an interlock means with a guide means that interlocks with the rotary member for moving the pressing member into the pressing position, as recited in the claims. The Office Action states that the “pin/slot connection” is seen to fulfill the functions of the interlock means. However, the pin/slot connection in Fatheree does not provide the clamping force of the guide means portion of the interlock means. In Fatheree, the pin/slot connection simply acts as a cam to force the mandrel (35), and thereby force the clamp member (43), to move laterally as the mandrel (35) moves up and down. The pin/slot connection, in Fatheree, does not provide any clamping or pressing force in conjunction with the rotary member to move the pressing member into the pressing position. The Office Action states that the Drive Head (59) of Fatheree is the rotary member recited in the claim. However, Fatheree has an additional structure of a shaft (47) that interlocks with the drive head (59) to provide a clamping or pressing force. See Fatheree col. 3 lines 8-9.

Docket No. F-8660

Ser. No. 10/553,173

Similarly, in Vanistendael the cam slot (33b) is simply to force the subpiston (31), and thereby to force the arm (35), to move laterally as the subpiston (31) moves up and down in the cylinder (17). See Vanistendael col. 4 line 60 to col 5 line 2. The cam slot (33b), in Vanistendael, does not provide any clamping or pressing force in conjunction with a rotary member. Instead Vanistendael is a power clamp that uses hydraulic pressure in the main piston (28) for moving the arm (35) into clamping position. See Vanistendael Abstract. In contrast to the cited art, the present invention integrates the function of providing a pressing force and a cam guide for a pressing member into the same structural elements. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the cited art does not teach or suggest an interlock means with a guide means that interlocks with the rotary member for moving the pressing member into the pressing position.

In order to further differentiate the present invention from the prior art an additional structural limitation specifying that the gradients of the guide surfaces are not vertical has been added. In both Vanistendael and Fatheree some portion of the cam slot is vertical. See Vanistendael Figure 2 and col 4 lines 64-66 and Fatheree Figure 1. As disclosed in the present invention the guide surfaces are never vertical as such a portion would not provide a clamping

Docket No. F-8660

Ser. No. 10/553,173

force. Thus, the claim as amended clearly excludes an embodiment as that disclosed in the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time for 00000036 10553173
01 FC:1251 120.00 OP
responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$120 for the one month extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg, Esq.
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

Docket No. F-8660

Ser. No. 10/553,173

and,

By M. Zev Levoritz

M. Zev Levoritz
Reg. No. 50,151
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Enc. Form PTO-2038